

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-6, 8-9, 15 and 86-96 are currently pending. Applicants have amended Claims 1, 5 and 6. Applicants have cancelled Claim 7, and the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is thus moot. Applicants have added new Claims 86-96.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 8, 9 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ignatius et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,278,432).

Amended Claim 1 specifies “a plurality of optoelectronic devices positioned within the housing, the optoelectronic devices emitting radiation having at least a threshold light intensity approximately equal to an energy density of the emitted radiation divided by a radiation time period.”

Ignatius et al. discloses an array 10 of LEDs 14 that “yield a monochromatic light emission output in 620-680 and/or 700-760 nanometer ranges.” *Ignatius et al.*, col. 3, lines 38-40; col. 4, lines 11-13. The LED array of Ignatius et al. may have applications such as the irradiation of animal or human tissue. *Id.* at col. 4, lines 54-56. However, Ignatius et al. does not disclose an appropriate threshold light intensity, energy density, or radiation time period for treating mucositis or any other medical conditions. Thus, independent Claim 1 and dependent Claims 2-6, 8-9 and 15 are allowable.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Dependent Claim 4

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ignatius et al. in view of Drollette (“LED’s in Space: Can Light Hasten Healing in Space,” Biophonics International, September/October 2000). Claim 4 depends from Claim 1 and is therefore

allowable for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1. Claim 4 may include additional patentable subject matter not specifically discussed herein.

Dependent Claim 5

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ignatius et al. in view of the MCW/NASA LED Home Page (July 15, 1999). Claim 5 depends from Claim 1 and is therefore allowable for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1. Claim 5 may include additional patentable subject matter not specifically discussed herein.

Dependent Claim 6

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ignatius et al. in view of MCW/NASA LED Home Page and further in view of Qbeam Solid State Lighting System specification taken from the following URL address on December 4, 2000:

<http://web.archive.org/web/20001204152800/http://www.quantumdev.com/>.

Claim 6 depends from Claim 1 and is therefore allowable for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1. Claim 6 may include additional patentable subject matter not specifically discussed herein.

NEW CLAIMS

Applicants have added new method Claims 86-96. Applicants respectfully submit that the new method claims are being added in accordance with election made after the restriction requirement. Applicants respectfully request consideration of new Claims 86-96.

Appl. No. 10/077,917
Response dated October 3, 2003
Reply to Office action of May 28, 2003

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment and allowance of pending Claims 1-6, 8-9, 15 and 86-96.

Respectfully submitted,

C 7-2

Casimir F. Laska
Reg. No. 30,862

Docket No. 77054-9023-01
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108
(262) 956-6507